

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were pending in this application. Claims 16-32 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 7-12 and 14-15. Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 1-15 for reconsideration.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to for improperly incorporating by reference a Japanese priority application, because of inconsistent numbering of elements, and because of multiple reference numbers enclosed in parentheses. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended the specification to correct the objections noted by the Examiner.

The Office Action also set forth an objection to the drawings. Applicants have filed concurrently herewith a Request for Approval of Drawing Changes for Figs. 4-9 and 16 to amend Fig. 16 to include a legend of "Prior Art," to remove foreign characters and to remove reference signs not mentioned in the description. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. With respect to claim 1, Applicants have amended the claim to make each recitation a positive limitation and to include proper antecedent basis for each recitation of "steam" and "temperature." Applicants have also amended claim 1 to clarify that the "at least one high-temperature section" is in the gas turbine system. In the rejection, the Examiner asserted that the term "high-temperature" is not defined. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 recites that the temperature of the at least one high-temperature section is at a temperature higher than a temperature of the steam from the heat exchanger. Thus, the term "high-temperature" is relative to the temperature of the steam from the heat exchanger.

With respect to claims 2 and 10, Applicants have amended these claims to include proper antecedent basis for each recitation of "steam."

With respect to the recitation "said high-temperature section" in claims 2-3 and 10-11, Applicants have amended claim 1 to provide proper antecedent basis.

With respect to claims 4 and 12, Applicants have amended the recitations "being adapted to supply" and "is adapted to receive" to make each recitation a positive limitation. With respect to "said combustible gas," claim 1 recites that the coal gasification system produces a combustible gas. Claims 4 and 12, as amended, recite that a series of elements that are in the coal gasification system. Accordingly, the recitation "said combustible gas" in claims 4 and 12 is the same as the recitation "a combustible gas" in claim 1.

With respect to claim 6, the “gas turbine connector” recited in claim 6 is in the “gas turbine system” of claim 1, as recited in claim 3. Claim 1 recites that the “combustible gas” is supplied to the “gas turbine system.” Accordingly, the recitation of the “combustible gas” has proper antecedent basis. The recitation “said nitrogen gas” has proper antecedent basis as well. Claim 4 recites that the “gasification substance producing unit” produces a “nitrogen gas,” and claim 6 recites that “said nitrogen gas” is supplied to “said gas turbine combustor.” Claims 4-6 clearly recite that the “nitrogen gas” is supplied to both the “coal supplying unit” and the “gas turbine combustor.”

With respect to claim 7, the recitation “high-temperature section” has been amended to recite “said at least one high-temperature section,” as suggested by the Examiner.

With respect to claim 8-9, Applicants have amended “the flow rate” to recite “a flow rate.” With respect to “said combustible gas,” Applicants submit that this recitation has proper antecedent basis as discussed above. Furthermore, Applicants have deleted the recitation “high pressure” from claim 9.

With respect to claims 14-15, Applicants submit that this recitation has proper antecedent basis as discussed above.

The Office Action next rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being incomplete. Applicants have amended claim 1 to make clear the origin of the steam as from the heat recovery system. Applicants have also amended claim 9 to make clear the relationship of the air compressor.

The Office Action then rejected claims 1-6, 10-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahnke et al. (U.S. Patent 5,345,756) in view of Rice (U.S. Patent 4,571,935). Claim 1 recites that in an integrated coal gasification combined cycle power generator (IGCC), a steam turbine system performs expansion work, the steam turbine system comprising a condenser to condense steam from a heat recovery system into water, the water being supplied to a heat exchanger in a coal gasification system, where the water is heated to steam, and wherein the steam from the heat exchanger is supplied to at least one high-temperature section of a gas turbine system which is at a temperature higher than a temperature of the steam from the heat exchanger.

Jahnke et al. discloses that exhaust steam in line 197 is cooled and condensed in cooler 198 by heat exchange with cold water, and condensed boiler feed water in line 201 is preheated in heat exchanger 103 by indirect heat exchange (column 12, lines 22-28). The

preheated boiler feed water in line 202 is heated by successive passes through HSRG 181 (column 12, lines 28-30). Thus, as shown in Fig. 1, condensed water goes from cooler 198 to be preheated by heat exchanger 103 via line 201, and the preheated water is passed through HSRG 181 via line 202.

[In contrast to claim 1, Jahnke et al. fails to disclose or suggest that water from a condenser in the steam turbine system is supplied to a heat exchanger in a coal gasification system, where the water is heated to steam, and wherein the steam from the heat exchanger is supplied to at least one high-temperature section of a gas turbine system which is at a temperature higher than a temperature of the steam from the heat exchanger. Rather, as discussed above and as shown in Fig. 1, Jahnke et al. discloses that water from the cooler 198 is heated by the heat exchanger 103, but not heated into steam. Moreover, even if the preheated water is passed to the HSRG 181, Jahnke fails to disclose or suggest that the preheated water is supplied to a section of a gas turbine system which is at a higher temperature than a temperature of the preheated water. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Jahnke et al.]

In the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Rice teaches that steam generated by a steam turbine system is used to cool at least one section of the gas turbine system which is at a temperature higher than the temperature of the steam. Even if the Examiner's assertion is correct, [Rice fails to cure the deficiencies of Jahnke et al. Claim 1 recites that steam generated by a heat exchanger in a coal gasification system, not the steam turbine system, is supplied to a high temperature section of a gas turbine system which is at a temperature higher than a temperature of the steam from the heat exchanger. Moreover, like Jahnke et al., Rice fails to disclose or suggest that water from a condenser in the steam turbine system is supplied to a heat exchanger in a coal gasification system, where the water is heated to steam.] Accordingly, even if combinable, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Jahnke et al. and Rice. Claims 2-6, 10-13 and 15 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Jahnke et al. and Rice by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations.

The Office Action further rejected claims 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahnke et al. in view of Rice, and further in view of Perkins et al. (U.S. Patent 5,160,096). Even if combinable, Perkins et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Jahnke et al. and Rice. Like Jahnke et al. and Rice, [Perkins et al. fails to disclose or

suggest that water from a condenser in the steam turbine system is supplied to a heat exchanger in a coal gasification system, where the water is heated to steam, and wherein the steam from the heat exchanger is supplied to at least one high-temperature section of a gas turbine system which is at a temperature higher than a temperature of the steam from the heat exchanger.] Accordingly, claims 7 and 14 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Jahnke et al., Rice and Perkins et al. by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations.

Lastly, the Office Action rejected claim 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahnke et al. in view of Rice, and further in view of Iwata et al. (U.S. Patent 5,327,718). Like Jahnke et al. and Rice, [Iwata et al. fails to disclose or suggest that water from a condenser in the steam turbine system is supplied to a heat exchanger in a coal gasification system, where the water is heated to steam, and wherein the steam from the heat exchanger is supplied to at least one high-temperature section of a gas turbine system which is at a temperature higher than a temperature of the steam from the heat exchanger.] Accordingly, claims 8 and 9 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Jahnke et al., Rice and Iwata et al. by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request reconsideration. Should the Examiner have any questions or suggestions regarding this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

February 6, 2001
Date

FOLEY & LARDNER
3000 K Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D. C. 20007-5109
Tel: (202) 672-5300

Manoj Kumar Reg. No. 43,250
by Johnny A. Kumar
Reg. No. 34,649

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.